

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claim 11 is cancelled herein.

In view of the above, claims 1-10 are pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION of CLAIM 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY BARBAROSSA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,392,807)

Claim 10 is amended herein to depend from claim 8, adding further limitations thereto. Thus, the arguments below with respect to claim 8 also apply to amended claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 and 5-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CHEN ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,099,531)

Amended claim 1 recites that outputted light is transmitted in a direction tilted toward said first side surface relative to a direction perpendicular to said one of the two reflective surfaces. Amended claim 8 recites somewhat similar features. As the Examiner stated, Chen does not teach that "the incident light is transmitted through said first side surface (63 in Figure 7F) and, then passes between the reflective surfaces to be reflected by said second side surface." See page 4, lines 12-14, of the Office Action. However, the Examiner then asserted that "how and where to place the second side surface is just a matter of design choice." Chen fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as recited in amended claim 1.

Chen discloses that an entrance window may be formed by a prism, as illustrated in Figs. 7D through 7F. See column 10, lines 17-21, of Chen. Light entering the entrance window of the prism reflects internally within the prism before impinging for a first time on one of the parallel surfaces. See column 10, lines 21-24, of Chen. Conversely, amended claim 1 recites that outputted light is transmitted in a direction tilted *toward* said first side surface relative to a direction perpendicular to said one of the two reflective surfaces. Thus, Chen does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited, for example, in amended claim 1.

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited reference.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIM 4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CHEN ET AL. AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 1 ABOVE AND IN VIEW OF BARBAROSSA ET AL.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and adds further limitations thereto. Thus, claim 4 also distinguishes over Chen and Barbarossa per the arguments above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-23-2007

By: Michael A. Leonard II
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501